THE VEDANTA KESARI

"Let the lion of Vedanta roar."

"Let me tell you, strength, strength is what we want
And the first step in getting strength is to uphold
The Upanishads and believe that 'I am the Atman.'"

—SWAMI VIVEKANANDA.

VOLUME XII] SEPTEMBER 1925 [NUMBER 5

PRAYER

यो देवानां प्रभवश्चोद्भवश्च
विश्वाधिपो रुद्रो महर्षिः ।
हिरण्यगर्भं पश्यत जायमानं
स नो बुद्ध्या शुभया संयुनक्तु ॥

HE is the source of all the gods and from Him they have proceeded. He is the ruler of all—the terrible destroyer and the great seer. He first beheld the birth of the universe. May He give unto us noble thoughts!

GOSPEL OF SRI RAMAKRISHNA

Dakshineswar Temple—June, 1883

I

IT is the 8th of June, the summer of 1883. The evening service in the Mother's temple is over. Sri Ramakrishna is fanning Her.

Ram, Kedar Chatterjee and Tarak have come from Calcutta to visit the Master with offerings of flowers and sweets. Kedar is an elderly gentleman of fifty and very devout. The very name of Lord fills his eyes with tears. He was formerly an adherent of the Brahmo Samaj, but after following various other sects, he has now taken shelter in Sri Ramakrishna. He is an accountant in a Government Office.........Tarak is about 28 years old, and is the son of a great Sadhaka. He had married but soon after lost his wife. He would often come to Ram's house and pay visits to Sri Ramakrishna with Ram and Nitya Gopal though he was still employed in an office. His heart finds no joy in the world and is ever thirsting for God.

Sri Ramakrishna comes out of the temple and salutes the Divine Mother, bowing to the ground. He sees the devotees eagerly waiting for him. He is highly pleased to see Tarak and strokes his chin in affection.

The Master is sitting on the floor of his apartment lost in ecstasy. He has put forward his feat which Ram and Kedar have beautifully decorated with flowers and garlands. Kedar is holding the Master's toes believing that thereby he will have the Master's spiritual power communicated to himself.

Coming down partly to the normal plane, the Master says, " Mother, what can he do to me by holding my toes ? "

Kedar folds his hands in humility. The Master is still absorbed in ecstasy. He says to Kedar : " Your

mind tends towards *kamini-kanchana* though you profess otherwise."

"Forward! After sandelwood, there are the silver mine and the gold mine and the diamonds! Think not you have achieved the goal because you are a little inspired."

The Master converses with the Mother: "Mother! Remove him hence!" Kedar is frightened: he asks Ram, "What does the Master mean?"

The sight of Rakhal enraptures the Master again. He asks Rakhal: "I came here long long ago. When did you come?" Does the Master mean that he is the Lord incarnate and that Rakhal is one of his associates?

On Saturday, the 10th day of the bright fortnight of Jaishta, corresponding to the 15th of June, 1883 A. D., Adhar and M. have availed themselves of the holiday to visit Sri Ramakrishna at the temple of Dakshineswar. There have come also Rakhal's father and his father-in-law, that is to say, father of his (Rakhal's father's) second wife; the latter has long heard of Sri Ramakrishna and being a *Sadhaka* has come here to pay his respects to the Master.

The noon-day meal has been over. The devotees are seated on the floor of the Master's room and the Master from over his small cot is looking from time to time at the "father-in-law."

Asks the father-in-law: "Sir, is it possible to realise God in the Grihasta-Asrama?"

Sri R. (smiling): "Why not? Live like the mud-fish. It lives in the mud but the mud does not stick to its body. Live again like the corrupt woman who attends to her household work but has her heart always on her paramour. So do you perform your worldly duties, fixing your whole mind on God. It is however very difficult. I told the Brahmajnanins, 'If you keep condiment, tamarind and jars of water in the same room with

a delirious patient, how can you expect him to be cured? The very idea of tamarind makes the mouth water and the woman is verily a tamarind condiment to the man. And what is the jar of water? It is the perpetual thirst for the world. Thirst is never appeased. The delirious patient says: 'I shall drink a whole jar of water.' The world again is full of distractions. 'If you go this way I shall throw.......at you, if you go that way I shall throw the broomstick, if you go the other way I shall throw the shoe.' And you cannot contemplate on God except in solitude.

"If I am repeatedly disturbed in the melting of gold for ornament, how can I do the melting? Suppose you are cleaning rice; you must do it yourself. You must take samples of it from time to time to see how far it is cleaned. If, however, you are again and again called away, while working, how can the cleaning be properly done?"

A devotee: "What, then, is the way out, sir?"

Sri Ramakrishna: "Yes, there is a way out, can you have intense renunciation? Only then is there hope. Give up with strong determination whatever you know to be false.

"When I was ill, I was taken to Gangaprasad Sen and was told by him to take *Swarna Parpadi* and must therefore desist from drinking water and only take pomegranate juice instead. They all thought I would not do without water; but I made a strong resolve. As a Paramahamsa—not a duck but a swan*—I shall drink milk!

"You must live in solitude for a time. Never fear if you have once touched 'the old lady' in the game. Be 'gold'; then you can live anywhere you like. After attaining devotion and realising God in solitude, one can live in the world as well.

*Reference is made to the mythological swan which can separate milk from water when both are mixed together and kept for it to drink.

"(To Rakhal's father) Hence I ask the boys to live here, for thereby they will get Bhakti and then they can return to the world."

A Devotee : "If God is doing everything why then should there be any distinction between good and evil, virtue and vice. Sin also is His will!"

Father-in-law of Rakhal's father:"How can we know His will? 'Thou Great First Cause art least understood.'"

Sri R. : "There are virtue and vice. But He Himself is unaffected by them. The air contains smell both fair and foul but is not affected by it. Such is the nature of His creation. It is a mixture of good and evil, even as the species 'Tree' subsumes under it mango, jack-fruit, and hog-plum and various other trees. Don't you see how even a wicked man is necessary. An estate where people are turbulent requires a turbulent man to be sent to it. Only then can they be controlled."

The conversation again turns on the householder's life. Says Sri Ramakrishna : "The fact is, that life in the world means so much wastage of the mind. The loss that accrues from this waste can be made up only by one's becoming a *Sannyasin*.

"The first birth is given by the father. There is the second birth when one is invested with the holy thread. There is yet another birth when one takes *sannyasa*. *Kamini* and *kanchana* are the two obstructions. Love of woman takes man away from the path of God and he never knows how he falls. When I visited the fort (the Fort Williams of Calcutta) I did not at all feel that I was going along a sloping road. When I reached the Fort, I found how far below the level I had come. Alas! it is not given to men to know this. Captain says that his wife is a *jnani*. A man possessed by ghost does not feel that he is so possessed : he says he is alright.

"And there is not only the fear of lust in the world but there is also anger. The moment one is thwarted in one's desire one gets angry."

M. : "When sometimes a cat pounces on my food, I cannot drive it off."

Sri R. : "Why? What harm even if you strike it once in a way? The householder must *hiss* though not sting or do any actual harm. But in order to save himself from his enemy, he must feign anger. Otherwise the enemy will take advantage of his passivity. One who has renounced need not, however, hiss."

A Devotee : "Then, Sir, I see it is very difficult to realise Him in the world. How many can do that? No, I find none."

Sri R. : "Why not? I have heard of a Deputy Magistrate in that district. His name is Pratap Singh, he is charitable, meditative, devout and is endowed with many qualities. He sent for me. Yes! There are such people."

II

Sri R. : "Sadhana is essential. But, of course, if one has real faith, faith in the words of the Guru, one has not to practise very hard.

"Coming to cross the Yamuna, Vyasa met a party of Gopis at the ferry ghat. They also wanted to cross the river but no boat was available. They therefore prayed to Vyasa to find a means. Vyasa said 'I will take you to the other side; but I am very hungry. Have you got anything for me to eat?' The Gopis had plenty of milk, curd, and butter. He ate the whole lot and then going to the water side, he prayed 'Oh! Yamuna: if I have not eaten anything to day, then let your waters part making way for us to go over to the other side.' No sooner had he finished the prayer than the waters actually parted and a way was made.. The Gopis were struck dumb with

amazement. They thought, 'Just now he ate so heavily, yet he prayed: if I have not eaten anything, etc.' Even such strong faith is needed! 'Not I, but it is Narayana abiding in my soul, who has eaten.'

"Though Sankara was a knower of Brahman, he still was not quite free from the sense of separation in the beginning, and his faith was not firm. He had just come out from the Ganges after bath, when a chandala, carrying a load of flesh, happened to touch him. Sankara cried out 'What! you touch me!' The chandala replied: 'Sir, neither did you touch me nor did I touch you. The pure Self is neither body nor mind, nor is It the five elements or the twenty-four principles.' This gave Sankara the perfection of knowledge.

"When Jada Bharata carrying the king's palanquin began to discourse on self-knowledge, king Vahugana came down from his seat and asked him, 'Who are you?' Jada Bharata replied 'I am neti, neti, the negation of everything, *i. e.,* the Pure Self.' He had the perfect faith that he was the Pure Self.

" 'I am He. I am verily the Pure Self.' Such is the theme of jnanins. The Bhaktas say that these are the glories of the Lord. Who could know a man to be rich if he had not the splendour of wealth? But of course it will be quite a different thing when seeing the devotion of his Bhakta, The Lord will say 'I and thou art one.' Suppose the king is sitting on his throne and a servant comes and ascends the throne and sitting there says 'Oh king I am the same as yourself', will not the people think him to be mad? But if, pleased with his services, the king one day says to him, 'Come, sit by me, there is no harm in it, you are the same as myself,' and he ascends the throne and sits there, there will be nothing wrong in it. It is not good for ordinary individuals to say 'I am He! I am He!' It is to water that the waves belong, not the water to the waves.

"The truth is, you cannot attain Yoga until your mind has become calm, whatever path you may tread. The mind is under the control of the Yogi not the Yogin of the mind. When the mind is calm one gets *kumbhaka.* This state of *kumbhaka* is attainable also through Bhakti yoga. Through the excess of Bhakti one's breathing stops. Singing the refrain, 'My Nitai is like unto a mad elephant' when a man is entranced in ecstasy, he can no more recite the whole line: he can barely say 'Hati', 'Hati' which culminates in a single sound 'Ha'. Breathing stops in ecstasy, and that is *kumbhaka.*

"Suppose some one is sweeping and a neighbour comes and tells him that a certain person is dead. Now if the deceased be not his relation, he continues sweeping only saying now and then, 'What a pity! the man is dead, he was a good person.' His sweeping goes on undisturbed. But if the deceased be a relative, then the broom-stick at once falls from his hand and he swoons with a groan. His breathing stops and he cannot think or work for some time.

"Have you not noted of women how, when any of them gazes at anything in wonder or listens to any one with gaping mouth, others remark whether she is in a trance? This is also an instance to the point. Her breathing stops, so she looks on with her mouth open in wonder.

"Merely repeating 'I am He,' 'I am He,' won't do. There are signs of the *jnanin.* Narendra's eyes are very prominent. (About Mani) His forehead and eyes also have auspicious signs. There is another thing: all have not the same spiritual state. The *jivas* have been classified under four heads: bound, seeking freedom, free and eternal. It is not true that all have to practise *sadhana.* There are *Nitya Siddhas* and *Sadhana Siddhas.* Some realize God and others are men of realization even from their very birth, like Prahlada. There is a bird called Homa which lives high up in the sky. When it lays its eggs, the eggs begin to fall from the sky and as they

fall, they break and the young ones come out. They also fall down and down, but before reaching the earth they grow their wings even during their down-ward course. Then when they sight the earth, they know that to fall down on the earth is to die instantly, and at once they turn back in upward flight to their mother. So also, *Nitya Siddhas* only call on Mother.

" Prahlada and others who belong to the category of the Eternally Free realize God before they practise *sadhana* even as the gourd and pumpkin plants bear fruits before the flowers come out.

" (To Rakhal's father) A *Nitya Siddha,* even if he be born in a low family, is a *Nitya Siddha* and nothing lower. A gram seed fallen in a dung heap produces a gram plant and nothing else.

" He has endowed different men with different measures of powers ; it is as a wick burning in one place and a torch in another. By one remark of his I found out the depth of Vidyasagar's intellect. When I spoke of the difference of powers in men, he said, 'Then Sir, Has He given powers unequally ? '

" 'Yes, certainly He has,' I replied, 'had there been no inequality of power, why is it that you are so famous and we come to visit you ? We have heard of your learning and compassion. Therefore we come. Certainly you have not grown two horns on your head !'

" Though so learned, so renowned, yet Vidyasagar made such an unwise remark : 'Has He endowed men unequally ?' Do you know what it is ? Only the big fish are at first caught in the net. But when the fisherman stirs the mud, the small fishes come out and are netted. Even so when a man is not a knower of God, the small fries of his mind by and by come out. Mere scholarship does not avail."

HINDUS HAVE BEEN EVOLUTIONISTS 4000 YEARS*

SWAMI PRABHAVANANDA

WELL has it been said by Sir Monier Williams : "Indeed if I may be allowed the anachronism, the Hindus were Spinozites more than 2000 years before the existence of Spinoza ; and Darwinians many centuries before Darwin ; and Evolutionists many centuries before the doctrine of evolution had been accepted by the scientists of our time and before any word like evolution existed in any language of the world."

Yes, the doctrine of evolution was known in India long before the Christian era. About the seventh century B. C., Kapila, the father of Hindu evolutionists, explained this theory for the first time through logic and science.

The Hindus accept the scientific fact of evolution, but reject the metaphysical speculations of the scientists. For they have their own explanations, which are more logical and scientific. It would be well, therefore, for the scientists, as well as the theologians of the present day, to study the explanation of evolution as given by the ancient seers of India. I give here a few arguments with the hope that they may evoke the desire to study the ideas of the Hindu philosophers and scientists.

Nasata Sat Jayeta—"Existence cannot be produced by non-existence." That is the dictum on which is based the Hindus' philosophy of creation.

Non-existence can never be the cause of what exists. Something cannot come out of nothing. Says a philosopher of India : "That the law of causation is omnipotent and knows no time or place when it did not exist, is a doctrine as old as the Aryan race, sung by their ancient poet-seers, formulated by their philosophers, and made the cornerstone upon which the Hindu man even of to-day builds his whole scheme of life."

*Published in the San Fransisco Bulletin just on the eve of the sensational trial of professor John Scopes who was found guilty and fined for teaching the theory of evolution in the public school of Tennessee. The article was given a prominent place in the paper and has attracted wide notice in America. Vide Gleanings for the details of the case.

In explaining the theory of evolution, science admits of one principal factor in the process of evolution and that is the "tendency to vary". But is that "tendency to vary" indefinite or is it limited by any definite law ? Science fails to give any answer.

To put the question in another form : We find among us a Christ man or a Buddha man, the manifestation of perfection and divinity on earth. How did this perfection and divinity come to manifest in their lives ? Was the moral and spiritual nature in them super-added to the animal nature by some extra-cosmic spiritual agency ? We know such an explanation is neither logical nor scientific.

Let us see what the Hindus have to say on the point. The Hindus accept evolution and admit the laws of variation, but go a step beyond modern science by explaining the cause of that "tendency to vary." Their philosophers say : "There is nothing in the end which was not also in the beginning." This is a natural law which governs the process of evolution, as well as the law of causation. And if we admit this grand truth of nature, the "tendency" and the gradual manifestation of the higher nature of man through the process of evolution become easily explained. We notice the trend of scientific monism also is toward that end. J. Arthur Thomson, an eminent English scientist, says : "The world is one, not two-fold ; the spiritual influx is the primal reality and there is nothing in the end which was not also in the beginning."

And as such the Christhood or the Buddhahood is already there, the perfection and divinity is inherent—latent in every individual soul. It exists in the most minute bioplasm as well as in the highest man—the Christ man or the Buddha man. In the other forms it remains "involved," while in the highest type it becomes "evolved." Thus, according to the Hindu evolutionists, man is neither a descendant of an ape, nor of a fish, but comes from God—made in the image of God. Godhood is involved in every life, and that becomes evolved, as we find it in those known to mankind as Saviours or Divine Incarnations. God and divinity exist in the minutest protoplasm as well as in the highest man. The forms change slowly and gradually, giving rise to various species and forms, until the little bioplasmic cell evolves as man—ultimately to unfold as a Christ or a Buddha.

To quote Patanjali, a Hindu scientist and philosopher who flourished about the seventh century B. C. : "The change of

one species into another is attained by the 'infilling of nature.' " And he explains this "infilling of nature" by the simile of peasants irrigating fields from a river or reservoir. Our struggle for progression means taking away the obstacles and by its own nature the divinity will manifest itself, just as the water for irrigating will flow of itself if the obstruction is removed. The pressure is not therefore from outside but from inside. Each soul is the sum-total of the universal experiences already coiled up there, and of all these experiences, only those will come out which find suitable circumstances ; and the "tendency" is there because the "potential" divinity strives to become "kinetic."

The scientist, some 20 years ago, could have brought the one and only objection to this explanation of the Hindus, and that is : "What proof is there that there is Spirit and Consciousness in the minutest germ which evolves as the highest man ?" But today, the scientists themselves have proved there is "unity of life." "There is no such thing as 'dead' matter," writes Sir John Woodroffe, a Western student of Hindu philosophy, formerly the justice of Calcutta High Court. "The well-known experiments of Dr. Jagadish Bose (a Hindu scientist) establish response to stimuli in inorganic matter. What is this response but the indication of the existence of that 'Sattva Guna' (the tendency to manifest divinity) which Vedanta and Sangkhya affirm to exist in all things, organic or inorganic ? It is the play of 'Chit' (consciousness) in this 'Sattva,' so muffled in 'Tamas' (igonrance) as not to be recognizable, except by delicate scientific experiment, which appears as the so-called 'mechanical' response. Consciousness is here veiled and imprisoned by 'Tamas.' Inorganic matter displays it in the form of that seed or rudiment of sentiency which, enlarging into the simple pulses of feeling of the lowest degrees of organized life, at lenth emerges in the developed self-conscious sensations of human life. What varies is its wrappings. There is thus a progressive "release" of consciousness from gross matter through plants and animals to man. Indian doctrine has taught this evolution in its 84 lakhs of previous births."

To deny evolution, therefore, is to deny Christ, and to reject Christ and Christhood is to make science and evolution unscientific.

If we accept Christ as an ideal of perfection, how are we to explain the causes of his working out the perfection that he

manifested in his life ? (I do not consider worth noticing those that are dogmatic in their assertions about Christ. Let us be rationalistic and let Christianity stand on rationalistic grounds or let it fall). Now, there can be three alternatives. He might have been a freak of nature, an exception. In that case he cannot be made the ideal of our life. Or, he might have been the product of his parents, as many try to explain by *the theory of* hereditary transmission. But we know who his father was. Millions and millions of carpenters like Joseph had lived and are still living. How to bridge the gulf then between this father and the son who is worshipped as God by the people of the world ? The third alternative then is that he had evolved his perfection himself. The power and knowledge and divinity were accumulating and evolving there for ages and ages, until there burst into the society a Christ man. This to us seems the most rationalistic view. And to evolve that perfection, that Christhood, is the ideal and goal of every individual and is the end of the journey of life. "Be ye perfect even as the Father in Heaven is perfect." "The Kingdom of Heaven is within." *We Hindus accept Christ and* the truths preached by the Great Prophet. We Hindus know that the heart of all religions in the world is the same if the religions are understood properly. And we know that true religion is not opposed to true science.

PESSIMISM AND LIFE'S IDEAL : THE HINDU OUTLOOK AND A CHALLENGE

(*With a criticism of Life and an interpretation of History*)

PRINCIPAL KAMAKHYA NATH MITRA, M. A.

Rajendra College, Faridpur, Bengal.

(*Continued from page* 139)

MORAL life or the life of conscience (*dharma-jiban*) means primarily a fight with Nature (*pravritti*), for *Nature includes all the impulses Nature has implanted in us*, and progress in moral life means nothing but progress in our conquest of *artha* and *kama* (desire and means) or RAJO-GUNA and TAMO-GUNA which include all the six passions, viz., *kama* (lust), *krodha* (wrath), *lobha* (greed), *mada* (pride), *moha* (all sorts of infatuation) and *matsarya* (envy) and advance towards *sattwa-guna* and *nivritti* (return path or renunciation) ; or, in other words, moral progress means the progressive assertion of our manhood till at last we get beyond all the three *gunas*—realise the Absolute Good and achieve the final realisation of *Moksha* or *Nirvana* when all the fetters drop and *karma* is no bondage. This is a struggle and an achievement we come across nowhere in the animal world. It is nowhere to be found in Nature. *What is called higher nature is anti-Nature and not Nature, for the term Nature has a specific meaning* and we have no right to depart from this sense of the word. NATURE IS UNMORAL. MAN'S REVOLT AGAINST NATURE ARISES FROM A FEELING OF PROFOUND DISCONTENT. THIS DISCONTENT IS DIVINE AND IT IS NOTHING BUT PESSIMISM. IT IS THIS DISCONTENT THAT ULTIMATELY LEADS TO CONTENTMENT. Says Sankaracharya : "*Kathamiha manava tava santosha* (How, O man, can you have contentment here) ?" Says Vivekananda : "*Hetha sukh iccha matiman* (Do you want happiness here, O you intelligent man) ?" And Bhagawan Ramakrishna says in his homely way with his characteristic touch of humour : "Suppose you are a High Court Judge. You have got wealth, position, name, fame, sons and daughters. You think it is all right with you and God says : 'Amen ! Be it so !' Then a time comes when you say :'What have I done ?' and God says :

'What have you done indeed ?' " I do not pretend to know a better explanation of morality than this. How many types of ethical theory have we not seen in our days and how high-sounding are not their names—Utilitarianism, Eendœmonism, Evolution, Intuition, Hegel's Self-realisation according to which all the physical and mental faculties are to be harmoniously cultivated and according to which the complete extinction of desires, including sexual, is bad ! But *Pessimism, which is the foundation of ascetic or absolute morality, gives us an ideal which nothing can approach and than which nothing can claim to be more satisfactory.* This ascetic morality cannot be deduced from optimism or meliorism, and this is the last term of the evolution of morality. *Morality cannot evolve beyond this stage.* If anybody believes that it can, I shall be glad to see him explain his position. That the ASCETIC IDEAL IS NOT ANTI-SOCIAL and ASCETIC MORALITY AND PERFECT LOVE GO TOGETHER I shall show later on. It is this absolute standard that we must constantly keep in view. If we judge human conduct by this absolute standard, then only is it possible for us to fix its place and know its worth. There is no other means of evaluation I am aware of.

It is a matter of regret that there is so much reluctance to admit that ascetic morality, absolute morality or total renunciation is the highest ideal of life. The chief cause of the prevailing doubt as to the supremacy of the ideal is psychological. Ordinary men have such fondness for their natural impulses and propensities that they shudder at the thought of the extinction of all that they value in life, and in this country a subsidiary cause is that certain religious sects in recent times have been founded by householders who were all prayerful men, no doubt, and good men as the term is commonly understood, but who could not wholly subdue their desires and rise above all frailties. To assign to *sannyasa* a higher place is to lower the position of these sects. The talk of total renunciation or complete *vairagya* touches the self-love of these sects, and so there is no end of flutter in their dove-cots. Thus we see that in self-defence they cite those texts from the *Samhitas* which applaud the householder's life, though at other times their reverence for the *Samhita-kars* (law-givers) is not much in evidence. Poor Rajarshi Janaka is also trotted out now and then to save the situation ! I have yet to know that Rajarshi Janaka increased and multiplied like flies in summer till the

end of his days and had any yearning for creature-comforts like Tom, Dick and Harry.

I do not mean offence to anyone but plain truths have to be plainly told and the relation between cause and effect has to be established in this world of Maya. I think it unnecessary to quote Scripture to show that ascetic morality or *sannyasa* is the highest ideal of life. I shall show it by the ordinary process of reasoning. If you once admit that self-restraint (*indriya-nigraha, samyam*) is the very stuff of morality (*dharma*), then you will have also to admit that the man who has completely quelled his passions (*jitendriya*) is the man whose moral life (*dharma-jivan*) is the highest. If chastity is *dharma* at all, then you cannot but admit that absolute chastity or spotless celibacy (*lifelong brahmacharya*) is a higher life than the married state. By married life I mean the sexual relation between man and woman—not *the married life of Bhagawan Ramakrishna.* His was a married life absolutely free from lust. *His place is higher than that of any sannyasin the world has ever produced, not barring even the founders of the great religions of the world.* It is much easier to be a celibate than to marry and live with one's wife, and at the same time abstain from any carnal connection with her. It is much easier to avoid fire than to live in it and go unscathed. *What spiritual marriage is Sri Ramakrishna alone has revealed to the world.* It is not necessary to speak of any miracle in his life, for a miracle-monger he emphatically was not. *His married life is the greatest miracle the world has to show to man.* Whoever has tried in his life to realise this ideal knows how difficult it is, if not impossible. I know only of one instance that may be cited as *a very faint* parallel. From Porphyry's Letters to Marcella, it appears that the great disciple of Plotinus *perhaps* was successful in realising this ideal, but Porphyry's case is not exactly like that of Ramakrishna, for he married Marcella when he was sixty years old, and Marcella, when wedded to him, was a widow with several children, and they generally lived apart. Why he mentioned Marcella at all cannot be definitely said—platonic love has nothing to do with marriage—nor does his case rest on as clear a proof of absolute spiritual marriage as that of Bhagawan Ramakrishna of hallowed memory. It is very difficult to say why Ramakrishna married. May we not presume that he married in order to show the householders

how married life should be lived, in order that househeolers might at least strive after the ideal, if they could not fully attain to it ?

As in the complete conquest of lust lies the highest moral life, so does it lie in the complete conquest of greed or in absolute poverty—and absolute poverty without absolute chastity is inconceivable, for a householder with his wife and children must earn money to support his family, but money to him should not be all in all. Bread is necessary, but man should not live by bread alone. You cannot worship God and Mammon at the same time. " The son of man has not where to lay his head. " Here also Ramakrishna is our great exemplar. His fingers actually twisted at the touch of gold and he lived on what came to him without his asking.

What is true of lust and gold is also true of other passions. I have taken them piecemeal for the sake of convenience but they all go together.

I hope I have made my position perfectly clear. Now a question arises, and I have seen this question seriously put. The question is that if total renunciation be the ideal, then the ideal is surely a negative one (*neti-mulak*). Where is joy in this ideal ? Is it not a text of the Upanishads—*Ananda rupam amritam yadvibhati* (That which reveals itself as bliss) and does not the text apply to *Brahman ?* I do not propose to say anything particular about *Brahman* in this paper—*saguna* (with attributes) or *nirguna* (without attributes) ; *sakara* (form-ful) or *nirakara* (formless). Suffice it to say that no earthly joy can compare with the joy of *Mukti* (liberation)—*Yallabdhwa chaparam labham manyate nadhikam tata* (after gaining which there is nothing more for us to gain—after gaining which all desire ceases). Suffice it to say that *Vairagyam* (detachment or renunciation) is the secret of fearlessness, the secret of strength, for all fear arises from *asakti* (attachment)—*Sarvam vastu bhayanwitam bhuvi vairagyamevabhyam* (Everything is the cause of fear—it is detachment or renunciation alone that is the secret of fearlessness). This joy of *Mukti,* this fearlessness of *Mukti,* is a fact borne out by the great lives of all emancipated souls. Only we must bear in mind that bliss, joy or *anadam* is the last word of moral life, the last word of *sadhana* (religious exercises)—it is the state of *Moksha* or *Nirvana.* The first imperatives of moral life are negative and they cannot but be so. Eucken

in his *Truth of Religion* has very satisfactorily explained this fact. The first movement of moral or spiritual life is what he calls the negative movement or rejection which is the same thing as *Vairagya Sadhana* in Sanskrit. Mahatma Gandhi did his best to explain this truth to Rabindranath, the æsthetician and Bramo-Samajist, in his well-known article, "The Poet's Anxiety," that appeared in his *Young India* sometime ago, but God only knows whether the poet is convinced or not.

It will not do to be in a hurry for *anandam* before we have entered on the very first stage of moral life. We feel *anandam* as we advance, through the ungrudging approval of our conscience—and absolute bliss can but come to a man when *Nirvana* is an accomplished fact. THIS IS THE WISDOM OF INDIA. *Vishayanandam* (fleeting joys arising from the world of sense) must be sharply distinguished from *paramanandam* (the supreme bliss of liberation). "*Brahman* is *anandam, Brahman* is *rasa* (joy), *ergo,* for God's sake, eat, drink and be merry" is a sentiment which is the very quintessence of superficiality. Even Mark Tapley could not be jolly in the thriving city of Eden, but our optimists have out-Tapleyed Tapley himself—and to the credit of Tapley, be it said, that he was an honest fellow after all. The moral value of this sort of optimism I leave it to my readers to determine. It will not do to say unctuously :

"God's in His Heaven
All's right with the world."

There is another very amusing objection that is most seriously raised. It is asked in all solemnity : "If absolute chastity with absolute poverty is the ideal and if everyone follows that ideal, then what will become of the world with its man-power, politics, empire, army, navy, commerce, industry, theatre, cinema, music-hall, sports, games—in short, all the hurry and scurry of life ? Evidently these things will clean disappear." It is a very grandfatherly question, no doubt, for our grandfathers in India are very keen on the question of the propagation of the species, and marriage they look upon as a religious duty for all. To this question, the holy men who have renounced all will say in reply : "Well, if such a state of things really comes about, if the world really ceases to function through the practice of unbroken *Brahmacharya* (absolute chastity), then what can be a happier

consummation than this ? If the whole world attains *Mukti* (liberation) in this way, then what more remains to be desired ? The very purpose of life will then have been fulfilled. But as it appears from the tendencies of the times, there is very little apprehension on that score. Propagation of the species is going on at top speed and will most probably go on at this rate till the final dissolution against our will. IT IS THE DOING OF NATURE. The true ideal of life has nothing to do with it."

So far I have tried to show that moral life springs from Pessimism or deep sorrow and deep discontent with Nature, the end of moral life is *Sannyasa* or obsolute renunciation and that is why *Sannyasa* is the highest ideal of man. Most people, no doubt, will say that it is a very difficult ideal to follow, and some will go even so far as to say that it is quite impossible. All that can be said in reply is that the difficulty of the ideal is patent to all—*durgam pathastat kavayo vadanti* (strait is the path the sages say) ; were it easy like a joy-ride, it would be no ideal at all, but it is not altogether impossible, because it is a fact that there ARE men who are the embodiments of this ideal though numerically they are but a handful. In the words of Ram Prasad : " One or two only in a million can finish their play and smilingly, O Divine Mother, clappest Thou Thy hands. " That being so, some will say : " Why not lower the ideal a little so that it may be possible for many to realise it in life ? " The answer to such would be this : "No, that can never be ; if you lower the ideal, your realisation would be lower still, and man's misery will know no bounds." In the words of Ramakrishna to his disciples : " If I do sixteen annas, then only will you be able to do one anna, but if I do one anna, you will do nothing at all." Suppose a University student wants to pass his examination. If he aims at a first-class, he may take a third-class at least, but if he aims at a third-class, his failure is almost inevitable. He gets ploughed, ten to one, that is all. Let us take care that we never lower the ideal and let us see that we never become such consummate hypocrites as to deny the ideal itself, because it is hard or because we do do not find it in the lives of the founders of certain sects to which we may happen to belong. A very strict watch over the mind is absolutely necessary. Let us be kind to others but give no quarter to ourselves. Introspection should pierce our soul as a blade of steel. Let us never seek to justify ourselves but always think of what we are

and what we ought to be, what we are doing and what we ought to do, and what an abysmal chasm lies between the actual and the ideal.

That the ideal is hard was very well-known to the rishis of India, but they never denied or belittled the ideal. On the contrary, their emphasis was here, for they knew very well that *no emphasis is necessary where natural tendency is strong,* that emphasis should lie the other way about. Hegel's In and Through which everybody understands was certainly very well-known to them. Very well did they know that everyone has not the capacity to renounce all and the vast majority of men who are weak must pass through Nature, but what they never tired of repeating was that total renunciation is the ideal we must steadily keep in view and try to control our natural impulses as far as possible, for otherwise, we shall hopelessly degenerate into so many worshippers of Belial and Mammon making the world hideous. Hence comes the Hindu conception of CHATURVARGA (four-fould category)—*dharma* (moral law), *artha* (means), *kama* (desire) and *moksha* (liberation)—the plain meaning of which is that it is by restraining *artha* and *kama* by *dharma* that we should turn the current of our lives towards *Moksha* or liberation, the goal of our lives. Bhagawan Ramakrishna used to tell his householder disciples to "turn the current of their lives" (*mod ferano*). *Grihasthasrama* (the house-holder's life) should be nothing but this. It has no meaning unless it is in tune with the Absolute, unless we turn our face towards the Great Liberation. Like the conception of *Chatur-varga,* we have the conception of *chatur-asrama* (four-fold stage of life) and the conception of *chatur-varnya* (four-fold caste) according to *guna* (aptitude) and *karma* (work) and not necessarily according to heredity. But what has that great soul got to do with In-and-Trough who has subdued and transcended Nature and holds *Moksha* in the hollow of his hand *hastamalakavat* (like the small *amalaki f*ruit in one's grasp)—and what right have we to say that everyone must practise In-and-Through so that we may have the satisfaction to see everyone like us ? If a man is exceptionally strong, he will do nothing of the kind. If a big jump enables us to get to a place, where, then, is the necessity for wearily trudging all the way ? What folly can be greater than this ? Evolution in spiritual life any more than evolution in physical life does not necessarily mean gradualism, for Nature does make jumps and does march by leaps

and bounds as nations do in periods of Revolution. It is not only Huxley but De Vries also who thinks so, and the theory of De Vries has been quoted by Bergson in his *Creative Evolution.* William James in his *Varieties of Religious Experience* speaks of slow spiritual progress and quick spiritual progress as well. The former corresponds to the 'lisis', and the latter to the 'crisis' of medical science according to James, and the simile of James here is very appropriate, for it reminds us of what we call *bhava-roga* or 'world-disease' in Bengali.

In our shastras, there are texts in praise of *grihasthasram,* and this is as it should be, if *grihasthasram* is rightly understood ; but there are *Samhitas* (institutes or codes of law-givers) in which *grihasthasram* has been made compulsory for all and has been raised even above *sannyasa* and this, I submit, is wrong and no Hindu can accept such dictum as authoritative, for it is in conflict with the *Sruti* or Vedic revelation, and according to the Hindu canon of exegesis, wherever the *Sruti* clashes with the *Smriti,* it is the *Smriti* that must go to the wall and the *Sruti* prevail. The clearest Sruti text on this subject is *Yadahareva virajeta tadahareva pravrajeta* which means that the moment *vairagyam* dawns upon you, you should adopt *sannyasa,* or in other words, you may become a *sannyasin* without being a house-holder at all. This text has been quoted sometimes by Swami Vivekananda, and that the right interpretation is that given above appears also from the commentary on the text by that profound vedic scholar, Swami Dayananda Saraswati in his Rig-veda Bhashya Bhumika, *Varnasrama prakarana,* which I bring prominently to the notice of Lala Lajpat Rai, his disciple, who, from his place as President of the Hindu Mahasabha just held at Calcutta, spoke as follows : " No one is allowed to become a sannyasin or to undertake the duties of a preacher without having passed through the mill of grihasthasram."

As for the superiority of *Sannyasa* over *grihasthasram,* the clearest text is this :

Meru Sasapayor yat yat
Surya khadyotayoriva,
Sarit Sagarayor yat yat,
Thata bhikshu grihasthayo.

(*Yogopanishad, sloka* 109)

(The difference between a *Sannyasin* and a *Grihi* is to be compared to the difference between the Meru Mountain and the mustard-seed, the sun and the fire-fly, the streamlet and the sea).

Many other texts may be quoted, but the two characteristic texts I have given are enough.

Whether one can become a *Sannyasin* without being a *Grihi* and whether a *Sannyasin* is a higher being than a householder is a very vital question, and its spiritual significance tremendous. The reason why a man talks so glibly about the compulsory character of *grihasthasram* is that he does not care for *Sannyasasram* at all. He knows that a *grihi* always remains a *grihi* under the present circumstances of the country, and that, once in the mill, it is almost impossible for a man to come out of it. It might have been different in the ancient days, but now for a *grihi* to become a *Sannyasin* is nothing short of a miracle. The talk of the compulsory character of *grihasthasrama* is nothing but a dodge to kill *Sannyasa* itself. A man's whole spiritual outlook can be judged by his attitude towards the question as to whether it is permitted to a man to skip *Grihasthasrama* and become a *Sannyasin* at a bound. That is why Mr. C. F. Andrews whom we all love and who is a disciple of Rabindranath—he calls Rabindranath his *Guru-deva* though he appeals now and then to the practical vedanta and Mayavada of Swami Vivekananda—, that is why, I say, Mr. C. F. Andrews was quite puzzled and perplexed, for this is a question on which Rabindranath differs from Mahatma Gandhi. Absolute continence is the watch-word of the Mahatma, but Rabindranath must have romance and marriage by all means. So Mr. Andrews, in his perplexity, wrote an article in the *Modern Review* of Calcutta sometime ago and invited authoritative opinion as to the true Hindu view of the question. A certain correspondent, if I remember aright, quoted one of the very texts quoted above and wrote something very much to the point, but in the next issue, another correspondent quoted certain *Smriti* texts in support of Rabindranath, and then the learned editor whose sympathies are well known, in the exercise of his editorial prerogative, closed the discussion with the verdict that Rabindranath is right. Whether Rabindranath is right or the Mahatma is right is a matter I leave to my readers to decide. I only hope that they will weigh all the arguments I have advanced before they come to a conclusion.

Relative morality, that is, domestic, social, political and business morality has no meaning at all without asceticism as its foundation. The relative presupposes the Absolute. Yet the most astounding charge ever brought is that asceticism is anti-social. A more erroneous and perverse charge it is hard to conceive. Social welfare will be best secured, if the spirit of asceticism is rightly grasped. What is social justice and political justice without which social and politiacl reform can never be accomplished ? It means giving every man his due or in other words *renouncing* one's lion's share so that others may not suffer. *Evil means the principle of individuation* or selfish monopoly. Good means altruism. Renounce you will, however little, for social and political well-being, glibly you will talk of morality, social and political, and yet the fundamental principle of all such morality you will not accept—well, it is an instance of perversity the like of which we fail to see in the whole history of mental aberrations. There is no cause of fear whatever. None of your pet interests—social reform, political agitation, political nationalism, economic progress—none of these things, I am sure, will be left out of account, nay, all these will proceed as smoothly as possible, nothing will go astray, if only we learn to cherish reverence for Total Renunciation—the ideal of ideals. Art will be ennobled and purified by it, and Democracy will be transformed by its magic touch. Art without morality is pornography, and Democracy without reverence is mobocracy. TAKE CARE OF QUALITATIVE REALISATION AND QUANTITATIVE REALISATION WILL TAKE CARE OF ITSELF.

(To be continued)

GLEANINGS

WAS ADAM CREATED OUT OF THE 'DUST OF THE GROUND' OR DID IT TAKE MILLIONS OF YEARS TO PRODUCE MAN ?

THE news that Professor John Scopes, who was tried in Dayton, U. S. A., on the charge of teaching evolution, was found guilty and fined 100 dollars has startled the whole world and roused its indignation. The Judge in his charge to the Jury ruled that if the defendant had violated the law by teaching that man descended from the lower order of animals, he should be convicted. He further added that the question of the denial of the story of creation did not arise. The Jury deliberated for 9 minutes (!) and found the Professor guilty !

The following was published in an American newspaper prior to the Judgment :—

The Bible states with great clearness exactly how God created man—created him then and there in the Garden of Eden ; created him full-grown, complete.

But science has reason to believe that man was not created that day or any other day. In fact, science asserted that the human race is the result of millions of years of slow, patient development from the very lowest, shapeless globules of animated jelly which wiggled about in the prehistoric ponds and *oceans of ancient times.*

What the Holy Scriptures say must be true, and to teach school children that man developed from lower forms of animal life is a crime punishable by fine and imprisonment, according to the law of the State of Tennessee. And thus it has come about that Professor John T. Scopes a teacher in the high school in Dayton, Tennessee, has been arrested and will be put on trial for using a text-book in his classroom which says that geology teaches that the simple forms of animal life of millions of years ago became more complex "and culminated with a group which contains man himself."

But the entire world of modern science stands aghast at the spectacle of a school teacher being prosecuted for putting before his pupils one of the fundamental corner stones of scientific knowledge. Socrates was made to drink a cup of poison because he taught things in advance of his times, Galileo was forced to take back his statement that the earth moves around the sun, Copernicus had to flee for his life for discovering what is now the basis of modern astrology, Columbus was called a madman and driven from the council of Padua for "pretending that it was possible to sail around the world."

These men wisely submitted to the ignoramuses in power, but Giordano Bruno said once too often that the world goes round the sun and was burned at the stake; Spinoza, the great philosopher, was denounced and threatened by the government of Holland for new thoughts about the universe ; Roger Bacon, England's first scientist, spent fourteen years in jail for inventing spectacles, gunpowder and new thoughts; Eufame Macalyane was burned to death in Scotland for trying to ease the pains of childbirth, and the first doctors to use anaesthetics had to "bootleg" chloro-form to their patients at the risk of life and liberty.

Modern American scientists read of these ancient persecutions as part of the dark ages, like the burning of witches, and never dreamed that anything

of the kind could happen in this enlightened day. When Mr. William J. Bryan† denounced them as "scoundrels" for their evolution and Mr. Voliva, of Zion City raged and called down the wrath of Heaven because they still teach that the world is round and not flat, as he insists, they thought it a joke and kept right on making their discoveries and publishing them.

The news that laws to make it a crime to teach anything that might be construed as contrary to anything in the Bible were being agitated seemed to them too fantastic to be taken seriously. When they heard that such a law had actually been passed in Tennessee, still they were not disturbed. They knew that this country has many preposterous laws, which nobody pretends could be enforced, and Governor Peay, of Tennessee, was reported to have said when he signed the bill that here was another dead letter law.

Then like a bomb-shell came the arrest of Professor John T. Scopes in Dayton, Tennessee, and they wonderingly read the papers to learn what awful thing he had taught to corrupt the high school pupils of that little town.

Elsewhere on this page is the reproduction of the page of the text-book which Professor Scopes used in his classroom. For using these seemingly inoffensive words he has been arrested and held for trial. The book itself, "A Civic Biology," written by Professor George W. Hunter' was approved and adopted by the State Text Book Commission before the passage of the law and had been in use since 1919. Therefore Professor Scopes' "crime" consists in having taught from a book provided him by the very State that now proposes to punish him.

The scientists at first could not see what the fuss was all about, but Mr. William J. Bryan, who is generally given the credit for the anti-evolution law, came forward and triumphantly explained. If man was a product of evolution, then Adam could not have been created by the Almighty in one day and Eve could not have been made out of one of the ribs as told in the Bible. Therefore any man who taught evolution to children disputed the Scriptural narrative and must be punished.

Not only scientists, but inventors, researchers of every kind and all people who believe in the right of free thought and speech were stunned at the news. If this law proved valid and constitutional, then what else might they expect? No Scientist would be safe, they thought. If Professor Beebe, now dredging the bottom of the Pacific Ocean, brings up something that someone might not think agreed with a strict interpretation of the Scriptures, it would be safer for him to quietly throw it back again and say nothing.

Publishers of school books are wondering how they can meet such a law. The custom has always been to have these books written by experts in each field, but in scientific subjects such as biology, the only experts are scientists, and it would be hard to find a man of standing in that field who does not accept evolution just as he does the law of gravitation.

For such an authority to deny evolution or pretend to account for things on some other basis would convict him of dishonesty and make him ridiculous in the eyes of fellow scientists. Dr. Hunter, for instance, who wrote the book which got Prof. Scopes into trouble with the law, is professor of biology in Knox College, Illinois, and was formerly head of the department of biology of the De Witt Clinton School in New York City. He is a man of very high

†Run for Presidentship of U. S. A. thrice but never reached the goal, and who passed away just before the trial—Ed., *V. K.*

standing and yet it is such men as he that Mr. Bryan has called "dishonest scoundrels." Apparently the books for Tennessee will have to be written by some layman unhampered by too much knowledge of the subject.

The law which Professor Scopes violated was passed at the last session of the Tennessee Legislature, and became effective March 21 of this year, when Governor Austin Peay signed the bill. The preamble designates it as an act "prohibiting the teaching of the evolutionary theory in all universities, normal and all other schools supported in whole or in part by public school funds of the State."

The act continues, "that it shall be a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of $ 100 to $ 500, to teach any theory that denies the story of the Divine creation of man as taught in the Bible, and to teach instead that man is descended from the lower animals."

The law, while deplored in some parts of the State, is very popular in others, especially the mountainous and other wild districts, where the percentage ot illiteracy is higher than in almost any other part of the country. In these areas the anti-evolution propaganda made a strong impression, and the people are convinced that "scientific scoundrels" are trying to destroy their Bible and teaching little children that they came from monkeys.

By a curious twist of fate, Professor Scopes, the accused, and Mr. Bryan, the great propagandist and sponsor of the movement against evolution, were both born in Salem, Illinois. In that same State is Knox College, where Dr. Hunter, author of "Civic Biology," is teaching that science. Professor Scopes is a young man, and like most teachers and scientists has scanty funds of his own, but he will not need them. Hundreds of indignant people from all over the country have telegraphed and written assurances of help.

Roger N. Baldwin, director of the American Liberties Union, has stated that the organization would finance his defense. Clarence Darrow the famous Chicago criminal lawyer, and Dudley Field Malone of New York, sent the following telegram to Professor Scopes' lawyer :

"Judge John Randolph Neal,

Knoxvillee, Tenn.

"We are certain you need no assistance in your defense of Professor Scopes, who is to be prosecuted for teaching evolution, but we have read the report that William Jennings Bryan has volunteered to aid the prosecution, and in view of the fact that scientists are so much interested in the pursuit of knowledge that they cannot make the money that lecturers and Florida real estate agents command, in case you need us, we are willing, without fees or expenses, to help the defense of Professor Scopes in any way you may suggest or direct.

"CLARENCE DARROW

"DUDLEY FIELD MALONE."

On the other side will be arrayed equally imposing legal talent, and Mr. Bryan himself wants to make a speech.

It has often been pointed out that in former times the people themselves took a hand in the burnings and other persecutions largely because they made a great spectacle and furnished free public entertainment and excitement. These symptoms are visible in the tiny town of Dayton, which has suddenly been made

world famous by this case. For days there was delighted talk of the great doings that would be seen and heard when the case came to trial, and the only sad thing was that the little Court house could hold but a small fraction of the eager inhabitants of the countryside.

When it was reported that the big show might be transferred to Chattanooga or some other large city, the enthusiasts of Dayton were furious, and demanded that the case be tried right in their own town. So jealous is Dayton of the excitement and publicity that it has promised to build a temporary "hotel" to house the crowd that is sure to arrive. A resolution was drawn up threatening to boycott the Chattanooga tradesmen unless they ceased trying to steal their case from them.

The slow machinery of the law in Dayton was speeded up so that Professor Scopes might be put on trial in Dayton before some other community could get up a monkey case of its own.

At one of the Dayton indignation meetings Dr. Rappleyea, a physician and chemist, who has been a strong supporter of Professor Scopes, tried to explain to the multitude just what evolution is. He got no farther than the statement that man's ancestors were among the lower animals. At this point Thurlow Reed, a barber of the town, considered it a reflection on himself and his family, leaped upon the platform and started a fist fight with the doctor.

These mountaineers carry guns, and don't mind using them on occasion, so Darrow and Malone are perhaps taking some chances when they try to make the same statement, especially after Mr. Bryan has roused their fury.

It is a little hard to understand sometimes what it was in their teaching that caused the ancients to be put to death or otherwise persecuted. Socrates, considered one of the greatest minds and wisest men of all time, was forced to drink poison because "he corrupted the youth"—the very charge that is now being brought against the modern scientists. Yet even Mr. Bryan makes no objection to the teachings of Socrates, which the much bored college youth is to-day forced to translate from the Greek. The only complaint is by the boys themselves that the stuff is difficult and uninteresting.

Mr. Bryan, in claiming that the faith of the modern boy had been undermined and not at all like the youth of his time, was confronted by a statement of Mark Twain's, written long ago, in which he told of a schoolboy who gave a definition of faith as: "believing something you know ain't so."

Perhaps the most incredible of all persecutions, because it worked to the disadvantage of everybody, was the hounding of the doctors and others who introduced the blessing of anæsthetics. Nowadays everyone who has to undergo an operation for any other reason endure great pain, takes it as a matter of course that his physician will do all he can with ether, chloroform gas, cocaine, twilight sleep or some pain killer to relieve his suffering. One would hardly guess that anæsthetics were for a long time met with the bitterest fanatical opposition.

In 1591 long before the days of chloroform and ether, some sort of anaesthetic must have been known and used secretly in Scotland, because in that year Eufame Macalyane, a lady of rank and position, was accused of trying to get another woman to give her something to ease the pains of child-birth. She was tried, convicted and duly burned to death on the Castle Hill at Edinburgh, and great crowds watched and approved.

Scotch people of that day believed that the Almighty had laid a curse on woman because of Eve's misbehaviour, and that any attempt to mitigate woman's labour was trying to escape from the curse and therefore wicked. This was long ago, but the idea persisted in full force right up to the middle of the nineteenth century, when Dr. James Young Simpson, a physician far in advance of his times, advocated the use of chloroform at child birth in certain cases, just as it is given to-day. Instantly he was threatened with imprisonment and even his life was in danger on the same logic which had caused Eufame Macalyane to be burned.

Dr. Simpson was a canny Scot himself and met his persecutors with arguments as ridiculous as their own, and finally beat them by calling attention to the twenty-first verse of the second chapter of Genesis which relates that when God took the rib out of Adam in order to create Eve he caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam. Clearly this "deep sleep" was an anaesthetic of some sort. On the strength of that reasoning they allowed anaesthetics in Scotland.

In the United States and other countries the persecution of the angels of mercy who introduced these drugs died out, not so much on account of arguments but because people in agony demanded relief whether it was wicked or not. It is knowledge of things like this that have been done to scientists in the quite recent past which has made them anxious to see that the Scopes case is carried, if necessary, to the highest courts.

There was a time when the scientists could be hounded and driven out of a country without much harm but no longer. To-day our health and our daily bread depends on their activities. America's foreign trade depends on American manufacturer's ability to produce goods as cheaply as foreign nations can, even with their cheaper labour, and that, in turn, depends on the ability of our scientists to keep abreast of the others in improving processes of manufacture. Any persecution that would hamper these inventive minds or drive them to other countries would be a disaster such as sent Spain from the top of the European nations to the bottom of the list.

The only reason the scientist is in any more danger from the law than the rest of us is because there is an organised drive and propaganda against him. Elihu Root, one of America's greatest lawyers, commenting on the American habit of passing a law every time a crank or fanatic gets an idea, said recently:

"This country has reached a point where it is impossible for any American lawyer to know the law."

Yet ignorance of the law is no defense. The average citizen goes about violating the laws right and left. The only things that save him is the fact that the police can't know the laws either and that there would not be prisons enough to hold us all if they did.

But the "monkey-law" of Tennessee is now a well-advertised law, and if this law is upheld and Professor Scopes is punished the school children in that State will grow up in ignorance of one of the great fundamentals of science—unless wicked wise ones from outside the State "bootleg" the forbidden knowledge to them.

EDITORIAL NOTES

RELIGION AS THE FULFILMENT OF SCIENCE

ONCE a Jesuit Father was telling his students in a science class how planets have arisen out of stars and stars out of nebulæ ; at that one of the students objected, " How, Father, you spoke to us only the other day about Genesis and said that God created the earth, moon and stars out of nothing ! " The Jesuit Father coolly replied : " That is religion, my boy, and this is science. "

Indeed ! This sort of mentality is commonly prevalent among the people to whom religion is a matter of faith, and as such, it owes no allegiance to reason. The common contention of such people is that, in as much as the basic principles of religion are spiritual entities, no finite reason of man can approach them. Truths of religion and the origin of things, being transcendental by their very nature, can at best be facts of revelation only and no reason or human intellect can catch them. From the very beginning of the history of the religious institutions of the human society the theologians tried to lay a strong emphasis upon this point and exploited the credulity of the people to their own benefit. But time and again we have noticed with the march of human progress the reason of man raising a note of protest against such undue claims for faith.

As a result of such conflict between faith and reason the human society has often suffered from severe catastrophes. Even to-day, in this scientific age, when the voice of reason has gathered strength and volume enough to maintain its own against all onslaughts of faith, one witnesses instances like the Tennesse case where a science professor is punished for preaching the truths of science*, because they are against the so-called revelations of religion.

In this confusion and conflict and the fume of rage that arises out of blind eagerness to save their party at any cost against the opponent, the respective votaries of both Reason and Faith, Science and Religion, lose sight of one fundamental fact of human knowledge that it is the human mind that comprehends the Truth. It is the mind that feels the Truth by the stretch of its emotion and faith, or determines it through the

Vide GLEANINGS.

intellectual process of analysis and classification. And as in a healthy organism the left-hand can never have any quarrel with the right, so in a properly developed mind faith or emotion can never wage war against reason. Only in a pathological subject we notice the disharmony between reason and feeling ; and we call such a man insane. Similarly, in a civilized society, if such disharmony is noticeable in its thought-life, it must be taken as a sure indication of morbidity and lopsided development.

In the western world, since the days of Giuardino Bruno, rationalism has been at perpetual war with the cult of faith of the theologians. Many a valiant battle was fought ; and it was not unoften that the theologians, with the sceptred power at their back, were victorious. But the human mind has a peculiar partiality for Truth, तत्वपक्षपाति हि बुद्धि : So, with the growth of mind and development of reason, observation and scrutiny of facts of life and nature became unavoidable. And as a natural consequence of this expansion of human intellect, science slowly gained ground in the popular mind ; and the old faith of theology was often startled by its wonderful discoveries. Many a crudity of the doctrines and dogmas of the scriptures was reduced to dust by its sledge hammer blows and the main religions of the Semitic race themselves got rude shocks. And to-day we find in the whole of Christendom an attempt being made for a compromise that 'religion is religion and science is science and you shall never mix the twain'—an average Christian of to-day never allows his doctrinal faith to be disturbed by its logical issues being raked up by science, nor does he allow his political and civic life to be much interfered with by the creed and doctrines of the church. He has conveniently made two separate watertight compartments in life, as life secular and life religious. And perhaps that is the very reason why we witness to-day in the Western world that the spiritual elements of the religion of Christ have failed to produce any tangible effect upon the general character of the people, and religion has ever remained with them a matter of mere faith, an emotional assent. But they have developed wonderful civic virtues based upon the truths of science. And that has made their physical life more pronounced and assertive than the spiritual.

But in India we find quite a different order of things. Though the religion of the Vedas, no doubt, was proclaimed as

facts of revelation of the Rishis and as such transcendental and absolute in its fundamental basis, nowhere it was claimed for the Rishis, unlike the founders of other religions, a monopoly of these revelations. On the other hand it was proclaimed that the religion of the Vedas stand on the eternal verities of life and their revelations can come to any man who would raise himself high enough to reach them. It is the natural outcome of the growth of human mind ; and in that respect the Sanathana Dharma of the Vedas is as much a revealed religion as natural. Every man is born an heir to these revelations, it is his birthright, only he must acquire it. The religion of the Vedas further proclaimed that its truths are not to be accepted on trust, but should be verified. Nay, it is no religion if it ends only in faith and is not realized through experience. God, soul, and other spiritual verities are as much, nay, much more, facts of actual experience as any truths of modern empirical science. So the religion of the Vedas has thrown out the challenge to the whole world, and for all time, for the verification of its facts. Therefore the sages of India have conclusively proved to the world by their own life and precept that there is no real conflict between reason and religion. They have shown that religion means nothing but a serious attempt of the human soul to find its safe haven after the stormy and tribulous voyage of this life. The rudimentary note of all religions is the same as what is prayed for by the Vedic sage—

असतो मा सद्गमय तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय मृत्योर्माऽमृतंगमय ।

" Take me from the unreal to the real, from darkness to light, from the mortal to the immortal. " In fact this is also the fundamental search of all life, of all souls ; and its fulfilment is the goal of religion, and of science as well.

Man, from the very moment of his birth, finds himself in perpetual bondage, limitations, and darkness of ignorance, and the history of his whole life is but a history of an unremitting struggle to break these bonds, transcend these limitations, and dispel the ignorance ; and the Vedas say that the culmination of this struggle of life lies in the realization of the infinity of the life principle itself. The bondages and limitations of life arise from the ignorance of the eternal principles that underlie all life and existence ; and their realization means their actual knowledge, or in other words, making them the permanent factors of our consciousness. From this it becomes clear that the religion that promises salvation to man

cannot fight shy of reason, the most important faculty of the human mind, and rest on faith alone. If the truths of religion must be *realized* by the human mind, they must sink deep into human consciousness and become permanent factors of it, which process means a full satisfaction of, and mutual harmony among, all the three principal faculties of mind, emotion, reason, and volition—a harmony among the emotional, practical, and thought aspects of life.

आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः ।

—*Brahadaranyaka Upanishad.*

"The Atman has to be seen (realized) ; it has to be heard, intellectually determined, and then meditated upon." In this dictum of the Vedic sage is embodied the entire truth of the Vedic religion. The Atman, the basic principle of life, the reality of all realities, the First Principle, has to be *seen*. That is the goal of religion ; and that glorious vision dawns when the mind is disciplined and purified by *sravana* (hearing), *manana* (argumentation) and *nididhyasana* (meditation). And before the mind could take up the Atman as its sole object of meditation, it must be satisfied intellectually about the reality of the Atman ; and for that purpose *manana* or ratiocination is absolutely necessary. Before mind could assume the calm serenity of meditation its doubts and delusions must be dispelled by the help of Reason. All the great philosophers of India entered into their philosophical disquisitions with this sole object in view, to find out the logical basis of the truths of revelation, to help *manana,* and never with the idea of indulging in empty speculation and intellectual flight. Therein lies the great difference between Indian systems of philosophy and other schools. Here philosophy is made a handmaid to religion ; whereas the other schools like those of Europe remained satisfied with mere speculation and never touched the practical life of man. And that is the reason why we find in the Vedic religion such a wonderful harmony between faith and reason, between emotion and judgment, between principle and practice of philosophy.

श्रद्धाभक्तिज्ञानयोगादवेहि

—*Kayvalya Upanishad.*

"Know Him by faith, devotion, knowledge, and the mystic communion"—This is the injunction of the Vedas.

The most recen. findings of modern science can be summed up in the following words : (1) life is a continuum ;

(2) unity and indestructibility of matter ; (3) visibility in its effect but invisibility in its essence, *i. e.*, its dual visage of the knowable and the unknowable ; and (4) things are not what they seem, *i. e.*, the delusion of the senses. The details apart, the material science has reached the point in its scrutiny where matter has begun to elude its grasp : generally speaking there is not a shadow of doubt to-day in the mind of the scientist that the entity which goes by the name of matter and whose effect and expression are so palpable to the human senses is in itself perfectly inscrutable. But one thing is certain that there can be no *creation* in the strictest sense of the term. This universe of sense perception is but an unbroken series of phenomena or expressions of that primal substance without any beginning or end. Our observation or experience is but a snatch at a link of that entire endless chain. The phenomenon or the expression may be explainable in relation to its environment, but its central core remains always undeciphered. Erstwhile ago scientists thought themselves perfectly secure within the fortification of their empirical method and felt sure that they would be able to vanquish all superstition and ignorance of the spiritualists by unravelling the heart of matter. But their earnest search for the Real has all on a sudden produced an Instiegn who with the same weapon of empiricism has begun to demolish the fort of empirical science. So, naturally, the open-minded scientists, whose minds are not trammelled by the scientific supersitions, have begun to feel their position shaky, so far as the possibility of determining the ultimate truth of matter with the aid of this empirical method is concerned. But the *terra firma* of modern science is in its determination of the interrelations of the different aspects of this phenomenal world, and their practical value in work-a-day life.

The Vedic Rishis, thousands of years before, came exactly to the same conclusions in regard to the phenomenal world. Like the modern scientists they first declared

यदिदं जगत्सर्वं प्राण एजृति निसृतम्

—*Katha Upanishad.*

" Whatever exists in this world of change, all have come out of the vibration of *prana.*" *Prana,* the primal energy, vibrated, became kinetic and the world of phenomena issued forth. The multiplicty of phenomena is but in appearance, due to different degrees of vibration : the same energy assumes the

form of matter, light, heat, electricity, and various other forms in its different range of vibrations.

य एकोऽवर्णो बहुधा शक्तियोगात् वर्णाननेकान् निहितार्थो दधाति

—*Swetaswathara Upanishad.*

"Himself, though one and colourless, but appears as many and of varied colours in conjunction with His power." Further, like the modern scientists, the Vedic sages found that life is but a continuation of a long chain of sentient existence, at one end of which is a tiny blade of grass and at the other end the perfect souls like the Buddha-man or the Christ-man. Evolution of species through the process of self-preservation and self-determination by fighting with the environments was already a known fact to them as a natural conclusion of their general spiritual theory of evolution. In that they went far beyond the point the modern evolutionists are scrambling to reach. With them evolution was not only true with species, but also with individual members of a species, without which the plan and purpose of evolution itself becomes meaningless and infructuous. In determining the relative value of the phenomena of matter they were not a whit behind the modern scientists. On the other hand, their absolute valuation of the transcendental saved them from the apotheosis of matter and made it possible to keep their eyes clear to see the really Real. In their keener penetration into the heart of matter they found that Energy works not only as physical forces of attraction and repulsion, but also appears as thought and emotion in the psychical world, and so they gave it an all-comprehensive name, *prana,* which means the energising factor of all objects, living and non-living, and thus did solve finally the problem that is haunting the modern scientists as to whether the ultimate state of matter is corpuscular or homogeneous, ponderable or imponderable. To them mind appeared as much material as any other object of the physical nature. In their intuitive grasp of things Matter revealed itself in its true colour and they discerned it to be nothing more than a mere series of phenomena or expressions, a chain of changes—*Shadavikari, i. e.,* consisting of the sixfold change, *viz.,* origin, continuation, augmentation, disintegration, mutation, and destruction. And that is why they gave this material world the name *Jagat.* Within this definition of matter of the Vedic sages there come naturally all the verities of the physical as well as the psychological world. There remains only one element of human

experience that refuses to come within this category of matter owing to its inherent immutable nature and that is the principle of pure consciousness of man which forms the veritable basis of all experiences, subjective and objective ; and therefore they called this immutable principle of consciousness spirit or *chit* in contradistinction to the mutable matter.

Even the empirical demonstrations of modern science have made it perfectly clear that the heart of substance of a thing is quite different from its outward expression, its outward form, and its values in the relative usage are not at all determined by, or commensurate to, its inner reality. The single example of diamond and charcoal will make our point perfectly clear to our readers. There is a perfect order and interrelation between an object and an object in this world of expressions. Yet these relativities never explain the thing itself in reality. The modern scientist as well as the modern philosopher has to acknowledge it at every step of his holy pilgrimage to the temple of the Truth. And exactly this is the thing that the Vedic thinkers proclaimed from the housetop even in that pre-historic age— वाचारम्भणो विकरोनामधेयम् । "In name only does exist the truth of transmutation," *i. e.*, the reality of the so-called change and expressions has no absolute value and is a mere delusion of words. The appearance is but a delusion, *Maya*, inexplicable in terms of reality. So we see the grand Maya theory of the Vedantins is being corroborated by the modern scientists in each step of their advancement towards the fundamental. "Things are not what they seem."

The only difference that exists between the ancient Vedantic thinkers and the modern scientists lies in the estimate of values. Both are one in accepting the human mind as the only instrument of adjudicating truths. As truth or reality is essentially a matter of human consciousness and its value lying in its bearing upon the human life, there cannot be any room for make-belief, hearsay, or empty faith in the determination of the Real. Religion must be a science of God— the ultimate reality of all things, and as such there should be no quarrel between religion and science It is true that the soul of religion, God, is a transcendental entity and therefore beyond the reach of all intellect and reason, but it is the reason itself which tells us so. It is the human reason that says that God is beyond its reach—नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्य न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन

" This Atman cannot be attained by discourse and disquisition, nor by intellect, nor by much scholarship. " Hence religion means through reason to beyond reason, through science to beyond science. Modern science remains satisfied with the relative values and does not bother itself much about the absolute value. But life is not wholly mechanical, its forward quest is constantly urging it on to a point which is absolute in its nature and therefore we find the modern science, though able to get some creature comforts to mankind and remove many of its disabilities, yet has completely failed to give any permanent solace and stability of life to man. So it is high time for the scientist to own his own limitations and make peace with religion, and the religionist must extend his hand of love and sympathy to the scientist and declare that religion is not inimical to science, but is its natural fulfilment.

AN APPEAL

The Ramakrishna Mission, Madras, has opened a Free Dispensary for the poor of the locality on the premises of the Ramakrishna Math, Mylàpore, Madras. We request the charitable public to contribute their mite in money and medicine for the Dispensary. All contributions to be sent to the President, Ramakrishna Mission, Mylapore, Madras.

[NOTE :—The Sruti gives here the description of the creation of the world in a very peculiar fashion and quite different from what are spoken of in other parts of the Vedic literature such as the Samhitas, Aranyakas and other Upanishads ; and therefore it needs a clear understanding.

To an orthodox Hindu, the entire body of truths contained in the Vedas is of divine revelation, and as such, there can be no scope for self-contradiction in the Vedas. So all the orthodox commentators of Vedic literature, however divergent their views might be according to the respective schools they belonged, are all unanimous in accepting *ekavakyata* or uniformity as the supreme basic rule of exegesis so far as the Vedic literature is concerned.

Looking it from that point of view, it is but natural that commentators like Sankara, Sayana and others should take the process of creation as described in this Sruti, as a *secondary* creation following the primary, *i. e.*, the *bhuta srishti* or the creation of the elementary principles as described elsewhere in the Vedas.

Other critical students who never care for the *ekavakyata* rule, take as usual the *prima facie* meaning of this Sruti and find in it nothing but the flight of crude imaginings of the primitive mind. But to us it seems that the truth lies in neither of these.

All students of the Vedic literature who approach the subject with becoming reverence and traditional culture (*Guruparampara*) cannot fail to notice two things in the Vedic utterances, specially in its *Jnana Kanda.* The first point is that to explain matters of spiritual import the Vedic Rishis, like all other ancient thinkers, use profusely figures and imageries according to the then belief of things ; and secondly, the authors never meant these figures and imageries to be taken as real facts of life or of prime value, but that they should serve *only* to illustrate some higher and subtler spiritual truths which are ordinarily very hard to be understood.

We find two kinds of views obtaining in the Vedas about the creation and the worlds (*lokas*). One is the gross and concrete conception proceeding from the plane of sense perceptions. From this stand-point, the Vedic thinkers no

doubt, held the geo-centric view of the world, and the entire universe was conceived as a fourteen-storied mansion, the *chaturdasa bhuvanam*, one above the other. Our own earth, the *bhurloka*, denizened by mortal man, stands in the middle of these flights of worlds. The six upper ones are called heavens and the seven lower ones are designated as *pathalas* or nether regions. The sky or the intermediary space is the next higher world to the world of man ; the next higher is the *Suvarloka*, the celestial world of the bright ones, of which the Sun, Moon, and Stars form parts ; then there are higher and higher worlds up to the Seventh, the *Satyaloka* or the world of Brahma, the highest heaven. Of these seven heavens including man's world, the first three are most commonly met with in the Vedic literature as they are more intimately connected with an ordinary man's life and the progress of the soul. The names of the other heavens are incidentally mentioned in the Vedas. But the names of the *pathalas* or the nether regions are seldom met with in the principal Upanishads and Aranyakas. But they have been described in detail in the Puranas and other post-vedic literature.

From this stand-point, the higher worlds above *Suvarloka* are called or designated here in the Sruti as *ambha* or the world of celestial waters. Probably the name was suggested from the blue colour of the higher sky and also from the popular belief that rain came from the higher region. The *Suvarloka* or *dyuloka*, the shining heaven, is the next where the shining ones, the *devatas*, live ; and that is called here as the support of the *ambhaloka*, as it is supposed to be immediately below the latter. The intermediary space or the sky which is just above our head is the next world through which play the rays of light, and that is why it is called *marichi* here. Our earth is called the mortal world, as every creature of this world is liable to death. The nether regions are named here as *ap* or the world of water. Probably the name was suggested by the old belief that the waters of the ocean descend up to the nadir and pervade the entire nether worlds. But all these are based upon the crude popular beliefs of the time.

But the higher view of the Vedas regarding creation and the worlds is, in the first place, that there has been no creation ;

the manifestation of the visible is but a changed expression of the inner reality, Brahman, which is the fundamental principle and the fundamental substance as well. Creation means nothing else but evolution of *nama* and *rupa* from the unmanifested. And this evolution, although may have some pragmatic value, has no absolute reality in it, it is only a phenomenon, an aberration of experience. How could the absolute Brahman, one without a second, indivisible and infinite in nature, mutate into the gross physical world? The whole thing is a false reading of the Reality. Matter itself is but a shadow (*chhaya*), a glory (*mahima*), a power (*Sakti*), the Maya of the Supreme Being. Creation and the physical world are true only so far as man's physical life is concerned. But if things can be seen from the standpoint of the inner core of reality which is called in the Vedanta the *Atman* then the whole universe with all its manifold layers of expression would appear as so many concentric circles around that one common centre the *Paramatman*. All the fourteen worlds mentioned above are but so many planes of consciousness, each with the varied contents of its own. The grossest world is the outermost circle, receded farthermost from the centre; and the subtlest the *Brahmaloka* or *Satyaloka* as it is called sometimes, the plane of *Hiranyagarbha*, is the innermost circle. These fourteen planes range in their subtlety or grossness as they approach to, or recede away from the centre, the *Atman*.]

स ईक्षतेमे नु लोका लोकपालान्नु सृजा इति ।
सोऽद्भ्य एव पुरुषं समुद्धृत्यामूर्च्छयत् ॥ ३ ॥

सः he (पुनः again) ईक्षत meditated, इमे these लोकाः worlds नु assuredly (विनेश्येयुः will perish) लोकपालान् the rulers of the worlds सृजै shall create इति thus, सः he अद्भ्यः from water एव surely पुरुषं Purusha समुद्धृत्य having raised अमूर्च्छयत् gave form.

He again meditated: these worlds (will perish without rulers), so I must create their rulers. Then He raised the Purusha from water and gave him form.

[*From water*—i.e., from the unmanifested causal condition of matter.

Purusha—the Virat Purusha]

तमभ्यतपत्तस्याभितप्तस्य मुखं निरभिद्यत यथाऽण्डम् मुखाद्वाग्वाचो-ऽग्निर्नासिके निरभिद्येतां नासिकाभ्यां प्राणः प्राणाद्वायुरक्षिणी निरभिद्येता-मक्षीभ्यां चक्षुश्चक्षुष आदित्यः कर्णौ निरभिद्येतां कर्णाभ्यां श्रोत्रं श्रोत्राद्दि-शस्त्वङ् निरभिद्यत त्वचो लोमानि लोमभ्य ओषधिवनस्पतयो हृदयं निर-भिद्यत हृदयान्मनो मनसश्चन्द्रमा नाभिर्निरभिद्यत नाभ्या अपानोऽपानान्मृत्युः शिश्नं निरभिद्यत शिश्नाद्रेतो रेतस आपः ॥ ४ ॥

॥ इति प्रथमः खण्डः ॥

(सः that Atman) तं on that अभ्यतपत् brooded, अभितप्तस्य तस्य of that thus brooded on मुखं the mouth निरभिद्यत came out यथा as अण्डं in egg. मुखात् from mouth वाक् speech, वाचः from speach अग्निः fire, नासिके the nostrils निरभिद्येतां came out, नासिकाभ्यां from the nostrils प्राणः the smell, प्राणात् from the smell वायुः the air. अक्षिणी the two eyes निरभिद्येतां came out, अक्षिभ्यां from the two eyes चक्षुः the sight, चक्षुषः from the sight आदित्यः the sun. कर्णौ the two ears निरभिद्येतां opened out, कर्णाभ्यां from the ears श्रोत्रं the hearing, श्रोत्रात् from the sense of hearing दिशः the quarters. त्वक् the skin निरभिद्यत came out, त्वचः from the skin लोमानि the hairs, लोमभ्यः from the hairs ओषधिवनस्पतयः the herbs and the plants. हृदयं the heart निरभिद्यत sprang forth, हृदयात् from the heart मनः the mind, मनसः from the mind चन्द्रमाः the moon. नाभिः the navel निरभिद्यत came out, नाभ्यां from the navel अपानः the *apana*, अपानात् from the *apana* मृत्युः death. शिश्नं the generative organ निरभिद्यत came out, शिश्नात् from the organ रेतः the seed, रेतसः from the seed आपः water.

Then the Atman brooded on him, and when he was thus brooded upon there burst forth the mouth as of an egg. From the mouth came out speech, from speech *agni*.

There came out the two nostrils, from the nostrils the smell, from the smell the air.

There sprang forth the eyes, from the eyes sight, from sight the sun.

There came out the two ears, from the ears hearing, from the hearing the quarters.

There came out the skin, from the skin the hairs, from the hairs the herbs and trees.